The United States Thoroughfare,
Landmark and Postal Address Data Standard

Presentation by the
Address Standard Working Group
To the FGDC Standards Working Group
December 16, 2010

# Submittal of Final Version

- Final version is the result of numerous activities by the Address Standard Working Group:

  – Receipt of public comments (6/16/2010)

  – Review of and response to comments (6/16/2010 - 8/15/2010)

  – Revisions to draft Standard to reflect responses to comments (7/1/2010 - 11/1/2010)

  – Final proofreading (11/1/2010 – 11/15/2010)

  – Submittal to FGDC for adoption (11/15/2010)

# Receipt of Public Comments

- Total of 302 comments received

| Comment Type | Number received | Accepted | Accepted in Principle | Out of Scope | Rejected | No response necessary |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Editorial | 168 | 156 | 8 | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| General | 65 | 20 | 6 | 14 | 9.5 | 15.5 |
| Technical | 69 | 20 | 8 | 17.5 | 23.5 | 0 |
| Totals | 302 | 196 | 22 | 31.5 | 37 | 15.5 |

# Review and Response to Comments

- Comments categorized into Editorial, General and Technical

- Entire ASWG reviewed and determined response category (Accepted, Accepted in Principle, Rejected, Out of Scope, No Response Required)

- 2 comments had different parts each requiring different responses (reject/no response required, and out of scope/reject)

# Responses

- Responses were drafted in a separate document by members of the ASWG.  In a few cases, discussion was held with either the commenter, or a subject-expert to determine the most suitable response.

- All responses were reviewed by entire ASWG.

- Those responses requiring changes to the Standard were assigned to ASWG members.

# Revisions to Standard

- ASWG made revisions based on comments

- Key changes were:
  - Quality tests were re-organized to utilize views of the database rather than the database itself
    - More efficient processing
    - Easier for most users
  - Street Name Components were redefined to be more prescriptive and to provide additional examples to clarify parsing rules.
  - The .xsd was updated to match changes in the Standard.

# Further Revisions

- The NENA and Postal Profiles were updated based on the changes in the Standard.

- Appendices were updated to reflect changes in the body of the standard.

- All references were checked for currency and accuracy.

# Other Activities to Publicize Standard

- Four presentations were made during this time:
    - URISA/NENA Addressing Conference, August
    - URISA GISPro Conference, September
    - NSGIC Annual Meeting, September
    - MN GIS/LIS Conference, October
- The final draft was posted on the URISA Web page, and all work in progress was done on the wiki site for the ASWG, visible to all who requested access.

# Comments

- The standard has been widely reviewed and discussed by users at all levels of government, and in the private sector.

- The standard includes profiles for two of the largest users: the E-911 community and the postal/mailing community.

  - ASWG has worked with NENA standards committee on coordinating both standards.

- The standard is being adopted by a number of states and local governments, and is being used in many places today.

- The standard represents best practices for address data management.

- Training materials and implementation guide will be needed.